

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-37 are now present in the application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Claims 1, 12, 24 and 35 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Norris, U.S. Patent No. 5,557,749. Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engwer, U.S. Patent No. 6,947,483, in view of Norris. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "a look up table, for recording the data compressing method used previously and an identification number corresponding to each of the plurality of data receiving/transmitting apparatus."

Independent claim 12 has been amended to recite "the look up table comprising a plurality of data records for recording a data compressing method used previously and an identification number corresponding to each of the plurality of data receiving/transmitting

apparatus when the data processing system transmitting data to the plurality of data receiving/transmitting apparatus.”

Independent claim 24 recites “a look up table for storing a plurality of records relative to compressing methods used respectively and previously between the data receiving/transmitting apparatus and the data processing systems.”

Independent claim 35 recites “a look up table for storing a plurality of records relative to compressing methods used respectively and previously between the data processing system.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the above combinations of elements as set forth in independent claims 1, 12, 24 and 35 are not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Engwer fails to teach a look up table as recited in claims 1, 12, 24 and 35. However, the Examiner alleged that Norris in col. 5, lines 18-31 and lines 54-60 discloses the look up table of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Norris, through an OPEN routine 52, a sender negotiates a compression method with a receiver. The OPEN routine 52 initiates the negotiation by sending a message 76 comprising a list of data compression techniques available on the sender (col. 5, lines 18-21). In response, the receiver replies a message 78 comprising the data compression techniques understood by the receiver (col. 5, lines 21-26). Thereafter, “upon negotiating the compression method, the negotiated compression method is logged in the routing tables of both computer systems, block 62” (col. 5, lines 29-31).

In other words, the routing table in Norris stores the negotiated result of the OPEN routine 52, not the records relative to compressing methods previously used as recited in claims 1, 12, 24 and 35. Therefore, the routing table of Norris is different from the look-up table of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, the negotiated result of the OPEN routine 52 is determined based on the data compression techniques available on the sender in order of preference and the data compression techniques understood by the receiver in order of preference (col. 5, lines 18-26). Therefore, the negotiated result in Norris is not determined according to which compressing methods are previously used as recited in claims 1, 12, 24 and 35.

Moreover, claim 1 recites “a control module for determining a corresponding data compressing policy according to the record of the second data receiving/transmitting apparatus in the look up table before the transmitting data being transmitted to the second data receiving/transmitting apparatus.” Claim 12 recites “determining a corresponding data compressing policy according to the record of the target data receiving/transmitting apparatus in the look up table before the transmitting data being transmitted to the target data receiving/transmitting apparatus.” Claim 24 recites “a control module for determining a first data compressing method according to a first record corresponding to the first data processing system in the look up table.” Claim 35 recites “determining whether a target data processing system is recorded in a record of the look up table” and “transmitting an inquiring signal to the target data processing system if there is no record corresponding to the target data processing system in the look up table”. Since Norris does not teach the look up table of the claimed invention, Norris does not teach the above recitations of claims 1, 12, 24 and 35, either.

In addition, as shown in FIG. 6 of Norris, the WRITE routine 54 determines from the routing table if a compression method was successfully negotiated, block 63. If the determined result is NO (arrow 63b), the write routine 54 will directly send the uncompressed data to the receiver. On the contrary, in the claimed invention, if there is no record corresponding to the target data processing system in the look up table, the step of transmitting an inquiring signal is performed. Therefore, the method disclosed in Norris is quite different from the claimed invention.

Accordingly, neither of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of independent claims 1, 12, 24 and 35 or their dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 12, 24 and 35 and their dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 10/648,173
Amendment dated October 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2007

Docket No.: 5234-0170PUS1

Page 18 of 18

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

for BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP *#43,368*

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

